

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed December 12, 2006 (hereinafter "Office Action"), claim 1 has been amended. No claims have been cancelled and no claims have been newly added. Therefore, claims 1-36 are pending. Support for the instant amendments is provided throughout the as-filed Specification. Thus, no new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following comments, allowance of all the pending claims is requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9-13, 15-16, 20-24, 26-27, and 31-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,771,288 to Boulter ("Boulter"), in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0065814 to Ishii ("Ishii"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,968,363 to Mulvey ("Mulvey"). Claims 3, 6-8, 14, 17-19, 25, and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Boulter, in view of Ishii, in view of Mulvey, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,179 to Kekic et al. ("Kekic").

Applicants traverse these rejections for at least the reason that the references relied upon by the Examiner, either alone or in combination with one another, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all the features of the claimed invention.

For example, Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, the following features:

receiving through the interactive display updates to at least one propagation status of at least one of the bridging ports of at least one of the switches, **wherein propagation status includes an indication of whether or not a bridge port should be polled to obtain its current status;**

Similarly, independent claim 12 recites:

retrieve information associated with a plurality of switches, wherein each switch of the plurality of switches includes one or more bridge ports, wherein the information associated with the plurality of switches includes at least identifiers of the bridge ports of each switch and propagation statuses of the bridge ports, and **wherein propagation status includes an indication of whether or not a bridge port should be polled to obtain its current status;**

Similarly, independent claim 23 recites:

memory operable to store information associated with a plurality of network elements in the enterprise system, the network elements including a plurality of switches, wherein each switch of the plurality of switches includes one or more bridge ports, wherein the information associated with the plurality of switches includes at least identifiers of the bridge ports of each switch and propagation statuses of the bridge ports, and **wherein propagation status includes an indication of whether or not a bridge port should be polled to obtain its current status;**

Similarly, independent claim 34 recites:

retrieving information associated with a plurality of switches, wherein each switch of the plurality of switches includes one or more bridge ports, wherein the information associated with the plurality of switches includes at least identifiers of the bridge ports of each switch and propagation statuses of the bridge ports, and **wherein propagation status includes an indication of whether or not a bridge port should be polled to obtain its current status;**

Neither Boulter, Ishli, nor Mulvey, either alone or in combination with one another, disclose, teach, or suggest the claim feature "wherein propagation status includes an indication of whether or not a bridge port should be polled to obtain its current status." The Examiner alleges that Boulter discloses this feature in col. 7, lines 20-67; and col. 8, lines 35-58. See Office Action, pages 4-5.

In a portion of the cited passage, Boulter discloses:

In addition, panel 310 in mimic 140 includes user activated poll-rate sub-image 311. By clicking on poll-rate sub-image 311 a user can input a particular polling rate and, therefore, change the rate at which the Ethernet port statuses are polled and sub-images 302 are refreshed.

In this passage, Boulter appears to disclose that port status may be detected at a rate determined by the user. Accordingly, the poll-rate determines how often all the ports are polled for their status. In contrast, it is a feature of the claimed invention that the propagation status includes an indication of whether a port should be polled, thus allowing, e.g., updating of the status of a group of ports without polling all of the ports.

A further portion of the cited passage in Boulter discloses:

Port setup portion 320 displays port status control sub-image 326, which a user can activate to control network device 104. A user can manually enable or disable a particular Ethernet port in network device 104 by, e.g., clicking on a corresponding button at the bottom of port setup portion 320. In response, Web browser 209e transmits a request to network device 104, which computer 111 executes, causing command data corresponding to the action suggested by the activated button in port setup portion 320 to be transmitted from monitoring system 118 to the monitored network device 104 via network connection 108d. When command data are received by the monitored network device 104, a processor portion of network device 104 processes the command data and responds by changing the state of the monitored network device 104. A change in status of network device 104 is reflected by a change in a corresponding mimic sub-image 302 during the next update of sub-images 302.

In this passage, Boulter appears to disclose that a port can be enabled or disabled by clicking in port setup portion 320, and the corresponding mimic sub-image will be updated during the next interval. Accordingly, it appears that the updated port status is determined upon polling of all of the ports at the specified polling-rate. In contrast, it is a feature of the claimed invention that the propagation status includes an indication of whether a port should be polled, thus allowing, e.g., updating of the status of a group of

ports without polling all of the ports.

For at least the reason that neither Boulter, Ishii, nor Mulvey, either alone or in combination disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claim features of independent claims 1, 12, 23, and 34, the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn. Furthermore, claims 2-11, 13-22, 24-33, and 35-36 depend from independent claims 1, 12, 23, or 34 and are allowable for the reasons given above, as well as for the features they recite individually.

Conclusion


Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: **June 12, 2007**

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Brian J. Jelinek
Registration No. 58,396

Customer No. 00909

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
Main: 703-770-7900
Direct Dial: 703-770-7764
Fax: 703-770-7901